



"BFOX (Brian Fox)"  
<bfox@zgi.com>  
02/24/2005 01:33 PM

To <jill.uhl@serono.com>  
cc  
bcc  
Subject

1st half of pattern:

Prosites: C x(4,6) [FYH] x(5,10)  
patent: x(0,2) C x [QEK] [QEKNRDHS] [EQ] x(0,2) [YFW] [YFW] D x L L x x

Cys num: c1

2nd half of pattern:

Prosites: C x(0,2) C x(2,3) C x(7,11) C xx x x(1,3) [DNEQSKP] x x C  
patent: C [IMLV] x C xxx C x(6,8) C xx [YF] - - - C  
x(0,2)

cys num: c2 c3 c4 c5 c6

The prosite consensus pattern is generally much more flexible than the patent consensus pattern (i.e. the prosite pattern is more likely to detect a wider variety of true TNFRs but it will be less sensitive. The patent consensus will detect fewer TNFRs and it will be more sensitive).

However, the prosite pattern deviates substantially from the patent pattern between c5 and c6.

-----  
Brian Fox, Ph.D.  
Senior Computational Biologist  
ZymoGenetics, Inc.  
1201 Eastlake Ave E  
Seattle, WA 98102  
(206) 442-6707  
(206) 442-6608 (fax)

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE: This email is intended for the named recipient(s) only. It may contain privileged and confidential information. Any use of this information by persons other than the intended recipient(s) is prohibited. If you are not the addressee please notify us immediately by returning the original message to the sender by e-mail and deleting the material from any computer.